SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

### CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

	······································					
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS			
**			NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.			
ARTHUR STOLLER			1001 112 11011 12 13 12 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13			
-			ļ		•	
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff		County of Residence of	First Listed Defendant		
• •						
(c) Attornéy's (Firm Nat	ne, Address, Telephone Number and Email A	laaress)	NOTE: IN LAND	CONDEMNATION CASES, US	E THE LOCATION OF THE	
Taral Datterson For	u deo		•	NVOLVED.	•	
Tara L. Patterson, Esc						
Kimmel & Silverman, F	P.C.		Attorneys (if Known)		•	
30 E. Butler Pike					•	
Ambler, PA 19002		_				
(215) 540-8888		5	3			
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. C		RINCIPAL PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
			(For Diversity Cases Only) PT	r def	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF	
[] I U.S. Government	■ 3 Federal Question	Citi	zen of This State			
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)	1 0.00	M1101 1113 11111 0	of Business in This		
2 U.S. Government	☐ 4 Diversity	Cnti	zen of Another State	2 (2) Incorporated and P of Business In A	Principal Place O 5 O 5	
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III	)		of Business in A	Another State	
			zen or Subject of a O	3 🗇 3 Foreign Nation	O 6 O 6	
			oreign Country		·	
DU NACHDE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)					
IV. NATURE OF SUI	1 (Place and X in One Box Only)	Control of the same	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL IN		610 Agriculture	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	☐ 400 State Reapportionment	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 362 Personal Inj		620 Other Food & Drug	3 423 Withdrawal	☐ 410 Antitrust	
☐ 130 Miller Act	315 Airplane Product Med. Malpr		625 Drug Related Seizure	28 USC 157	☐ 430 Banks and Banking	
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability 🗇 365 Personal Inju		of Property 21 USC 881		450 Commerce	
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Product Lia		630 Liquor Laws	PROPERTY-RIGHTS	460 Deponation 470 Racketeer Influenced and	
<ul> <li>&amp; Enforcement of Judgment</li> </ul>	Slander D 308 Asbestos Po		640 R.R. & Truck 650 Airline Regs.	S30 Patent	Corrupt Organizations	
(i) 151 Medicare Act	330 Federal Employers' Injury Produ     Liability Liability		660 Occupational	☐ 840 Trademark	25 480 Consumer Credit	
(3 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	340 Marine PERSONAL PRO		Safety/Health		O 490 Cable/Sat TV	
(Excl. Veterans)	O 345 Marine Product O 370 Other Fraud		690 Other		810 Selective Service	
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment				SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff)	BS0 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange	
of Veteran's Benefits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 380 Other Person ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Property Da		710 Fair Labor Standards Act	☐ 862 Black Lung (923)	875 Customer Challenge	
160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Property Da Product Liability ☐ 385 Property Da		720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations	[] 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	12 USC 3410	
☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability			730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting	(7) 864 SSID Tide XVI	890 Other Statutory Actions	
196 Franchise	Injury		& Disclosure Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 891 Agricultural Acts ☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act	
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIERIGHTS PRISONER PETI	TIONS:	740 Railway Labor Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS  870 Taxes (U.S. Plainiff	893 Environmental Matters	
210 Land Condemnation	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 510 Motions to		790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc.	or Defendant)	894 Energy Allocation Act	
220 Foreclosure	O 442 Employment Sentence Habeas Corpus		Security Act	2 871 IRS—Third Party	O 895 Freedom of Information	
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	Accommodations			26 USC 7609	Act	
245 Tort Product Liability	☐ 444 Welfare ☐ 535 Death Penal		IMMIGRATION		900Appeal of Fee Determination	
290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - ☐ 540 Mandamus		462 Naturalization Application	1	Under Equal Access to Justice	
	Employment 550 Civil Rights		463 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee	1	950 Constitutionality of	
	3 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - 555 Prison Cont		465 Other Immigration		State Statutes	
	440 Other Civil Rights		Actions		· ·	
•	1	j			1	
				<u> </u>		
					Appeal to District	
	an "X" in One Box Only)	B	Trans	ferred from 6 Multidist	Isidaa Gara	
	emoved from 3 Remanded from tate Court Appellate Court			er district Litipation	, istagisuate	
Proceeding S				ועו	Juugincii	
	Cite the U.S. Civil Stanuts under which s	ou are filing	; (Do not cite jurisdiction	al statutes unless diversity):	0	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ION I					
VI. CAUSE OF ACT	Brief description of cause: Fair Debt Collection Practice	e Art				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				OUTCOV MEE and	y if demanded in complaint:	
VII. REQUESTED IN G CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION			DEMAND S	·		
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P. 23			JURY DEMAND	; ₽ Yes □ No	
	XE/6)					
VIII. RELATED CAS				DOCKET NUMBER		
	(See Instituted JUDGE					
Explanation:						
<u>г</u> арынанун.	4	Λ 6	Q			
nalmuli	1 . I <i>P</i> L	a the	William	)		
DATE USING	SIGNATUL	E OF ATT	ORNEY OF RECORD			

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be assignment to appropriate calendar.	$A \rightarrow A \rightarrow$
Address of Plaintiff: 5035 Southern Ster Terro	CC COUNTY
Address of Defendant: 507 Prudentral Road	Horsham PA 19044
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: (Use Reverse Side For A	
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation a	and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)	Yes No
(Attach two copies of the Discissary of the Disc	<del></del>
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes Neis
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	Date Terminated:
Case Number: Judge	<del></del>
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	· ·
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one y	100 100
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior	suit pending or within one year previously terminated
action in this court?	Yes No
a trade is out or any carlier	numbered case nending or within one year previously
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier	Yes O No
terminated action in this court?	1
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rig	hts case filed by the same individual?  Yes No.
A ONE CATECORY ONLY)	
CIVIL: (Place V in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)  A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: 1. D Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
I.   Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	2. © Airplanc Personal Injury
2. D FELA	3.   Assault, Defamation
3.   Jones Act-Personal Injury	4.  Marine Personal Injury
4. D Antitrust	5. D Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
5. C Patent	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please
6.   Labor-Management Relations	specify)
• •	7.  Products Liability
7. B Civil Rights	8. © Products Liability — Asbestos
8. © Habeas Corpus	9. All other Diversity Cases
9.   Securities Act(s) Cases	(Please specify)
10. □ Social Security Review Cases  11. ★ All other Federal Question Cases 15 U.S.C. \$ 1692	(1000-1-10)
11. XAll other Federal Question Cases 15 U.S.C. 3	
(Please specify) ARBITRATION CEI	RTIFICATION
(Check Appropriate	e Category)
Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge	and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of
S150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	
Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	26277
3-4-11 Jara Jara	son_ 8090
DATE:Attorney-at-Law	Altomey I.D.#
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only i	
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pendin	g or within one year previously terminated action in this court
except as noted above.	Clisss
3-411 /ara L TO11	erson 00395
DATE:	Attorney I.D.#

CIV. 609 (6/08)

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

## CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Arthur	Stoller	:	CIVIL ACTION	
	v.	: :		
NCO Fir	iancral Si	ystems. Inci	NO.	
plaintiff shall co filing the compl side of this for designation, that the plaintiff and	omplete a Case N aint and serve a c m.) In the even at defendant shall I all other parties	fanagement I rack Designation opy on all defendants. (See § I t that a defendant does not ag	ection Plan of this court, counse Form in all civil cases at the tire :03 of the plan set forth on the re- tree with the plaintiff regarding mit to the clerk of court and ser- esignation Form specifying the	verse said ve on
SELECT ONE	OF THE FOLI	OWING CASE MANAGEM	IENT TRACKS:	
(a) Habeas Cor	pus – Cases brou	ight under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 th	rough § 2255.	( )
(b) Social Secu and Human	rity – Cases requ Services denyin	esting review of a decision of g plaintiff Social Security Ben	the Secretary of Health efits.	( )
(c) Arbitration	- Cases required	to be designated for arbitratio	n under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	( )
(d) Asbestos – exposure to	Cases involving asbestos.	claims for personal injury or p	roperty damage from	( )
commonly	referred to as cor (See reverse side	es that do not fall into tracks (a mplex and that need special or of this form for a detailed exp	intense management by	( )
(f) Standard M	1anagement – Ca	ses that do not fall into any on	e of the other tracks.	<b>50</b>
3-4-11 Date 215-540	-8888	Tara L-Pattern Attorney-at-law 877-788-2864	Arther Stoller Attorney for Tpattersonocredit	<u>aw</u> .con
Telephone		FAX Number	E-Mail Address	

(Civ. 660) 10/02

i	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE					
2	EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA					
3 4 5 6 7 8	ARTHUR STOLLER,  Plaintiff  v.  Case No.:  COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL  Defendant  (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices)					
9	COMPLAINT					
10	ARTHUR STOLLER ("Plaintiff"), by his attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C.,					
11						
12	alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. ("Defendant"):					
13						
14	INTRODUCTION					
15	1. Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15					
16	U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA"), which prohibits debt collectors from engaging in abusive					
17	deceptive and unfair practices, and the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et					
18	seq. ("TCPA").					
19	seg. (TCIA).					
20	TOPICTION AND VENUE					
21	JURISDICTION AND VENUE					
22	2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states					
23	that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district cour					
24	without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court origina					
25	jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States.					

- 3. Defendant conducts business and has its principal office in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and therefore, personal jurisdiction is established.
  - 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1).
  - 5. Declaratory relief is available pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

#### **PARTIES**

- 6. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Columbia, Maryland.
- 7. Plaintiff is a person granted a cause of action under the FDCPA. See 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a), and Wenrich v. Cole, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18687 (E.D. Pa. Dec 22, 2000).
- 8. Defendant is a debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road in Horsham, Pennsylvania, 19044.
- Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6),
   and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

### PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

11. The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") is a comprehensive statute, which prohibits a catalog of activities in connection with the collection of debts by third parties.

See 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. The FDCPA imposes civil liability on any person or entity that violates its provisions, and establishes general standards of debt collector conduct, defines abuse, and provides for specific consumer rights. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k. The operative provisions of the FDCPA declare certain rights to be provided to or claimed by debtors, forbid deceitful and

misleading practices, prohibit harassing and abusive tactics, and proscribe unfair or unconscionable conduct, both generally and in a specific list of disapproved practices.

- 12. In particular, the FDCPA broadly enumerates several practices considered contrary to its stated purpose, and forbids debt collectors from taking such action. The substantive heart of the FDCPA lies in three broad prohibitions. First, a "debt collector may not engage in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692d. Second, a "debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. And third, a "debt collector may not use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692f. The FDCPA is designed to protect consumers from unscrupulous collectors, whether or not there exists a valid debt, broadly prohibits unfair or unconscionable collection methods, conduct which harasses, oppresses or abuses any debtor, and any false, deceptive or misleading statements in connection with the collection of a debt.
- 13. In enacting the FDCPA, the United States Congress found that "[t]here is abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors," which "contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy." 15 U.S.C. § 1692a. Congress additionally found existing laws and procedures for redressing debt collection injuries to be inadequate to protect consumers. 15 U.S.C. § 1692b.
- 14. Congress enacted the FDCPA to regulate the collection of consumer debts by debt collectors. The express purposes of the FDCPA are to "eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt

collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

#### FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 15. Defendant and others it retained began in or around May of 2010 constantly and continuously placing harassing and abusive collection calls to Plaintiff seeking and demanding payment for an alleged consumer debt of another person, specifically a "Meagan."
- 16. Upon information and belief, the alleged debt Defendant was seeking to collect arose out of transactions, which were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 17. Defendant and others it retained placed calls and left voicemail messages on Plaintiff's cellular telephone using automated telephone equipment.
  - 18. Defendant identified the debtor as "Meagan".
- 19. Plaintiff spoke with Defendant and others it retained on at least two (2) occasions to advise that "Meagan" did not live with him, that he did not know "Meagan", that Defendant had the wrong telephone number, and not to contact him anymore.
  - 20. Despite Plaintiff's instructions not to contact him, Defendant continued to do so.
- 21. Defendant and others it retained contacted Plaintiff, on average, approximately twenty (20) times per month.
- 22. Defendant left voice messages on Plaintiff's cellular telephone instructing Plaintiff to call a "Corey Roberts" back.
- 23. When Plaintiff returned the call asking for "Corey Roberts", Mr. Roberts was never available, giving the impression that he did not exist at all.
  - 24. Upon information and belief, Defendant used an automated dialer system

featuring a pre-recorded and/or artificial voice to leave messages on Plaintiff's cell phone.

- 25. Plaintiff did not expressly consent to Defendant's placement of telephone calls to his cellular telephone by the use of an automatic telephone dialing system or a pre-recorded or artificial voice prior to Defendant's placement of the calls.
- 26. None of Defendant's telephone calls placed to Plaintiff were based upon "Emergency purposes," as specified in 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).
- 27. The repetitive calls to Plaintiff were disturbing, harassing, and an invasion of privacy.
- 28. Defendant failed to investigate or verify contact information prior to and after calling Plaintiff and disregarded Plaintiff's instructions not to contact him.
- 29. Defendant failed, refused or was unable to update its records to sufficient to comply with his instructions and to avoid further harassment of Plaintiff.

## CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

- Durand, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." Russell v. Equifax A.R.S., 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp., 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); Clomon v. Jackson, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).
- 31. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit

-18

& Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be construed liberally in favor of the consumer." Johnson v. Riddle, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).

consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public - that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

# COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 33. In its actions to collect a disputed debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:
  - Defendant violated of the FDCPA generally;
  - b. Defendant violated § 1692b(2) of the FDCPA by informing Plaintiff that a 3<sup>rd</sup> party individual, "Meagan", owed a debt;

- Defendant violated § 1692b(3) of the FDCPA by calling Plaintiff more than
  once in connection for the collection of a debt for another individual;
- d. Defendant violated § 1692c(b) of the FDCPA by communicating with Plaintiff about a debt allegedly owed by 3<sup>rd</sup> Party, "Meagan";
- e. Defendant violated § 1692d of the FDCPA by harassing Plaintiff in connection with the collection of an alleged debt, in this case the debt of a 3<sup>rd</sup> party;
- f. Defendant violated § 1692d(5) of the FDCPA, when it caused Plaintiff's telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously with the intent to harass, annoy or abuse Plaintiff;
- g. Defendant violated § 1692f of the FDCPA by using unfair and unconscionable means with Plaintiff to collect or attempt to collect a debt;
- h. Defendant acted in an otherwise deceptive, unfair and unconscionable manner and failed to comply with the FDCPA.
- 38. As a result of the above violations of the FDCPA, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff in the sum of Plaintiff's actual damages, statutory damages, and attorney's fees and costs.

## COUNT II DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

- Plaintiff hereby incorporates all facts and allegations specified in all preceding paragraphs, by reference as if fully set forth at length.
- 40. The Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), 47 U.S.C. §227 et seq., prohibits the use of an automatic telephone dialing system or a pre-recorded or artificial voice to

place telephone calls to an individual on his or her cellular telephone. See 47 U.S.C. \$227(b)(1)(A)(iii).

- 41. A person may bring a private cause of action "based on a violation of this subsection or the regulations prescribed under this subsection to enjoin such violation." See 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(A).
- 42. Also, a person is entitled to bring "an action to recover for actual monetary loss from such a violation, or to receive \$500 in damages for each such violation, whichever is greater." See 47 U.S.C. §227(c)(5)(B).
- 43. The Court, in its discretion, is authorized to award up to three (3) times the actual damages sustained by a person for violations of the TCPA. See 47 U.S.C. §227(c)(5).
- 44. Defendant repeatedly and regularly placed non-emergency, automated calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone, leaving several messages using a pre-recorded or artificial voice.
- 45. Defendant did not have Plaintiff's express consent prior to contacting him on his cellular telephone using an automatic telephone dialing system or pre-recorded or artificial voice.
- 46. Defendant's conduct violated §227(b)(1)(A)(iii) of the TCPA by making any call using any automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial prerecorded voice to a telephone number assigned to a cellular telephone service.

### PRAYER FOR RELIEF: ALL CLAIMS

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, ARTHUR STOLLER, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

- Declaratory judgment that Defendant's conduct violated the FDCPA and the TCPA.
- b. All actual compensatory damages suffered pursuant to the FDCPA, 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);

- c. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- d. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff for the claims pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3);
- e. Statutory damages of \$500 for each violation of the TCPA, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(B); and
- f. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

## DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, ARTHUR STOLLER, demands a jury trial in this case.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

DATED:

03/04/11

KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C.

Tara L. Patterson Attorney ID # 88343 Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.

30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002 Phone: (215) 540-8888

Fax: 877-788-2864

Email: tpatterson@creditlaw.com